

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldszmidt et al. (US Patent No. 6,195,680). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As amended claim 1 requires that multiple audio sources be buffered within one device. Goldszmidt discloses a multiple server architecture (1.7) that has within it several different devices, such as control servers (1.1) and sets of smaller servers (1.2, 1.3). The architecture is not a device, but rather a network architecture of multiple, separated devices. Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of this claim.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for the own merits. Claim 2 requires that selection of one of the multiple audio sources be performed by a stream selector within the same device as the buffered audio sources. Again, Goldszmidt is directed to a multiple device system, and fanning out audio streams among those devices.

Claim 3 requires that a stream receiver exist in the same device as the buffering and the stream selector. The text to which the Examiner refers, such as column 3, lines 12-21, show that multiple devices are involved in the system of Goldszmidt, and that the stream receiver is not located on the same device as the buffering and the selector.

With regard to claim 4, Goldszmidt does not teach routing multiple audio sources in the same device to a stream receiver also located in the same device to select one and deliver it to a user as audio output. Applicant therefore submits that claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of this claim.

With regard to claim 5, Goldszmidt teaches about a client system that buffers the audio sources, but not buffering an audio source streams with a device that is buffering multiple streams.

With regard to claim 6, Goldszmidt does not teach selecting one of the audio sources is accomplished by either predefined user inputs or a present user input for multiple sources buffered in the same device. Applicants submit that claims 2-6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of these claims.

With regard to claim 7, Goldszmidt does not teach a receiver that has a stream manager that receives and buffers multiple radio sources within one device, and then selects

the radio sources. See column 5, lines 55-64. Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of this claim.

Claims 8-14 depend from claim 7 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. Goldszmidt does not show all of the components of the dependent claims being located on the same device. This is an advantage in that it allows a user to have a portable, self-contained radio device that allows smooth channel transitions with the buffered content. Applicants submit that claims 8-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of these claims.

Claims 15-17 should be ruled allowable for the reasons as applied to claims 1-6, in light of the Applicant's amendment.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed
Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613
Customer No. 20575